

COUNTY OF YORK

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 18, 2005 (BOS W/S 11/22/05)

TO: York County Board of Supervisors

FROM: James O. McReynolds, County Administrator

SUBJECT: Draft Comprehensive Plan – Summary of Citizen Comments

The Board conducted work sessions on October 11 and November 1 to review and discuss the draft *Comprehensive Plan* with a particular focus on areas where the draft plan recommends a change in land use designation. The duly advertised public hearing on the draft plan was conducted on October 25. In early November at the Board's direction, staff mailed letters of notification to all owners of property under consideration for a change in land use designation. Approximately 400 letters were sent (ten of which were returned by the post office for various reasons), generating a total of 49 phone calls, emails, and office visits to the Planning Division (which are detailed in the attached contact log). At its November 15 meeting, the Board provided an additional opportunity for comment by those property owners who had received notice of the potential change in land use designations. A total of 14 speakers offered comments at the November 15 meeting, two of whom had also called the Planning Division and three of whom spoke previously at the Planning Commission public hearing. The comments received at the Board of Supervisors' hearings are summarized below:

Burkes Corner (Intersection of Newman Road/Fenton Mill Road)

- Proposed change from General Business to Limited Business
- 4 parcels, 3 property owners
 - Three adjacent property owners spoke at the 10/25 public hearing to express opposition to any commercial designation on the east side of I-64 in the Skimino area. One of them submitted a petition signed by a total of 180 York County households and 42 James City County households.
 - Property owner response rate: 0%

Old Mooretown Road

- Proposed change from Economic Opportunity to Low Density Residential
- 14 parcels, 11 property owners
 - One property owner, stating that she was speaking for herself, her daughter, and three neighbors, spoke at the 11/15 meeting in opposition to the proposed change.
 - Two phone calls/office visits – one of them an inquiry only and one expressing opposition to the proposed change for a rear parcel that does not front on Old Mooretown Road.
 - Property owner response rate: 36.4%

Waller Mill Road/Bypass Road

- Proposed change from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential
- 57 parcels, 39 property owners
 - A representative of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation spoke at the 10/25 public hearing in opposition to the proposed change.
 - A realtor spoke at the 11/15 meeting on behalf of a property owner in opposition to the proposed change.
 - Two callers – One of whom inquired about how to respond to the Board on the proposed redesignation and later called again to express her support for the proposed change, and one who expressed opposition to the proposed change.
 - Property owner response rate: 10.3%

Lois Hornsby Property

- Multi-Family Residential to Medium Density Residential
- 2 parcels, 1 property owner
 - No comments received
 - Property owner response rate: 0%

301 Lakeshead Drive

- Proposed change from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential
- 1 parcel, 1 property owner
 - The property owner sent the Board a letter and spoke at the 11/15 meeting in opposition to the proposed change.
 - Property owner response rate: 100%

Queens Creek Road

- Proposed change from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential
- 22 parcels, 20 property owners
 - One property owner spoke at the 11/15 meeting in opposition to the proposed change.
 - Four callers – Two expressed concerns about the proposed change and two were inquiries only
 - Property owner response rate: 25%

Baptist Road

- Proposed change from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential
- 74 parcels, 56 property owners
 - Four representatives of the Henderson family of Bronx, New York and Farnham, Virginia, which owns approximately 34 of the 200 acres at the end of Baptist Road, spoke at the 11/15 meeting in opposition to the proposed change.
 - Three callers – One in support of the proposed change, one opposed to the proposed change, and one inquiry.
 - Property owner response rate: 7.1%

Waterview Road

- Proposed change from Limited Business to Low Density Residential and General Industrial
- 58 parcels, 8 property owners
 - No comments received
 - Property owner response rate: 0%

Route 17 (west) from Cook Road to Battle Road

- Proposed change from Medium Density Residential to Limited Business
- 8 parcels, 7 property owners
 - One property owner spoke at the 11/15 meeting in opposition to the proposed change.
 - Two calls/office visits – Both expressing concerns about the proposed change.
 - Property owner response rate: 42.9%

Route 17 (east) from Cook Road to Battle Road

- Proposed change from General Business to Limited Business
- 10 parcels, 8 property owners
- Parcels, property owners
 - Three callers – Two expressing concerns and one an inquiry only
 - Property owner response rate: 37.5%

Route 17 (west) from the CSX tracks to Fort Eustis Boulevard

- Proposed change from General Business and Limited Industrial to General Business
- 5 parcels, 4 property owners
 - No comments received
 - Property owner response rate: 0%

Fort Eustis Boulevard Extension (south side)

- Proposed change from Limited Industrial to General Business and Limited Industrial
- 7 parcels, 5 property owners
 - No comments received
 - Property owner response rate: 0%

Seaford/Bay Tree Beach/York Point

- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Conservation
- 261 parcels, 182 property owners
 - 22 callers – Ten indicating that they either supported or did not object to the proposed change, one opposed to the proposed change, one neutral, and ten inquiries.

- Two property owners (both of whom also called the Planning Division) spoke at the 11/15 meeting – One in opposition to the proposed change (see below) and one requesting information.
- NOTE: One property owner who spoke in opposition to the proposed change at the public comment period (and visited the Planning Division office) stated that he owns over 170 acres for which he may want to establish an aquaculture business such as a hatchery. It should be noted that the 185-acre parcel that he owns is already zoned Resource Conservation, where aquaculture is a permitted use, and would not be affected by the proposed change (aquaculture would not be permitted in RR). He also owns two small adjacent parcels at 901 and 903 Bay Tree Beach Road, the first of which (0.87 acre) is also zoned RC and the second of which (0.33 acre) is currently zoned Rural Residential. The letter he received was in reference to the 0.33-acre parcel only.
- Property owner response rate: 12.1%

Kentucky Heights

- Proposed change from Low Density Residential to Limited Industrial
- 85 parcels, 24 property owners
 - Three callers/email respondents – Two opposed to the proposed change and one an inquiry only
 - Two property owners spoke at the 11/15 meeting – One requesting information and the other expressing opposition to the proposed change.
 - Property owner response rate: 20.8%

Big Bethel Road/Route 134 Intersection

- Proposed change from a General Business node to a smaller Limited Business node
- 44 parcels, 33 property owners
 - Five callers – Three opposed to the proposed changes, one who had no objection, and one inquiry
 - One property owner spoke at the 11/15 meeting in opposition to the proposed change from General Business to Limited Business for her property on Route 134
 - Property owner response rate: 18.2%

In summary, of the 402 potentially affected property owners, approximately 62 (15.9%) have contacted the Planning Division or the Board to inquire about the proposed change to their property and in some cases express concerns, opposition, or support. Not surprisingly, most of the citizens' inquiries have been about the potential effect of the proposed changes on the value of their property. Of course, a change in land use designation in and of itself will have no impact on property values unless and until it is followed up with a change in zoning. In the event the property is rezoned, it is still not an easy question to answer. As the Board is aware, zoning is just one of many factors – such as acreage, sewer and water availability, and environmental constraints – that affect property values. There are, however, a few general statements that can be made:

- A parcel that is rezoned from R13 (consistent with the High Density Residential designation) to Rural Residential (consistent with the Low Density Residential designation) would be subject to a minimum lot size of one acre rather than 13,500 square feet (approximately 0.31 acre). As such the development potential – in terms of the number of subdivided lots that could be created – would be reduced by two-thirds for parcels that are at least an acre in size. As the Board will recall, several property owners spoke in opposition to the Low Density Residential designation at the 11/15 meeting, expressing a concern about the affordability of one-acre lots. However, it should be noted that Rural Residential (RR) zoning does not require one-acre lots in all instances. If developed under the cluster provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, an eligible RR-zoned parcel of land can be developed with smaller lots as long as the overall density is no greater than one unit per acre and at least 40% of the gross acreage is set aside as common open space. Also, as the Board is aware, small lots alone do not guarantee “affordable” housing.
- A parcel that is rezoned from General Business to Limited Business will have fewer uses permitted as a matter of right or with a Special Use Permit. A wide range of retail and office uses can be established in either zoning district, although there are some types of businesses – particularly auto-related businesses such as gas stations, auto dealerships, and repair garages – that are not permitted in the LB district. (See attached comparison chart.)
- A parcel that is rezoned from Rural Residential (consistent with the Low Density Residential designation) to Resource Conservation (consistent with the Conservation designation) would be subject to a minimum lot size requirement of five acres rather than one acre. For people who own less than two developable acres, the change in designation would have no practical effect since a parcel of that size could not be subdivided under either Rural Residential (RR) or Resource Conservation (RC) zoning; for people who own two or more developable acres, there would be a loss in potential lot yield ranging from 50% to 80% depending on the amount of land involved. In the Seaford/Bay Tree Beach/York Point area, which is proposed to change from Low Density Residential to Conservation (but where a number of properties are already zoned RC), 22 of the 261 affected parcels are at least two acres (although not necessarily two *developable* acres). Since the minimum lot size in RC is five acres, any parcels that are less than five acres would be considered non-conforming lots of record, which means that existing homes and other permitted uses could be expanded as long as they meet the applicable setback requirements, and new homes could be built on any undeveloped lots (assuming setback, water, and sewer requirements can be met). It should also be noted that the proposed change in land use designation would not impair any homeowner’s ability to reconstruct a home that is damaged or destroyed by a hurricane, fire, etc., which is provided for by the non-conforming use provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.
- For developed parcels, a change in zoning could change the status of the existing use from a permitted use to either a conforming special use or a nonconforming use. This could potentially limit the opportunities for expansion. For example, a

gas station on a GB-zoned parcel that is rezoned to LB would become a non-conforming use, which means that any expansion would require Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors review and public hearings, and the total amount of expansion could not exceed 50%. This provision would not apply, however, to home additions in non-residential districts (for example, if residential properties in the Kentucky Heights area were rezoned to Limited Industrial). In that scenario, additions would be permitted as long as applicable setback requirements are met.

In order to meet the state-mandated 90-day deadline to act on a draft comprehensive plan after it has been certified by the Planning Commission, it will be necessary for the Board to take action on the draft plan at its December 6 meeting. After receiving final direction from the Board at its November 22 work session, staff will incorporate all necessary revisions into replacement *Comprehensive Plan* pages, which will be presented to the Board for consideration.

Attachments

- Comprehensive Plan Contact Log
- Excerpts from Table of Land Uses comparing GB and LB zoning

P=PERMITTED USE S=PERMITTED BY SPECIAL USE PERMIT	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS						
Uses permitted in GB but not in LB													
USES	RC	RR	R20	R13	R7	RMF	NB	LB	GB	WCI	EO	IL	IG
	CATEGORY 10 - COMMERCIAL / RETAIL¹												
1. Antiques/Reproductions, Art Gallery							P	P	P	P	P		
2. Wearing Apparel Store							P	P	P		P		
3. Appliance Sales									P		P		
4. Auction House								P	P		S		
5. Convenience Store							S	S	S		S		
6. Grocery Store							P		P		P		
7. Book, Magazine, Card Shop							P	P	P		P		
8. Camera Shop, One-Hour Photo Service							P	P	P		P		P
9. Florist							P	P	P		P		P
10. Gifts, Souvenirs Shop								P	P		P		
11. Hardware, Paint Store								P	P		P	P	P
12. Hobby, Craft Shop								P	P		P		
13. Household Furnishings, Furniture									P		P		
14. Jewelry Store								P	P		P		
15. Lumberyard, Building Materials									S			P	P
16. Music, Records, Video Tapes								P	P		P		
17. Drug Store							S	S	P		P		
18. Radio and TV Sales								S	P		P		
19. Sporting Goods Store								P	P		P		
20. Firearms Sales and Service								S	S		S		
21. Tobacco Store								P	P		P		
22. Toy Store								S	P		P		
23. Gourmet Items/Health Foods/Candy/ Specialty Foods/Bakery Shops							P	P	P		P		
24. ABC Store								P	P		P		
25. Bait, Tackle/Marine Supplies Including Incidental Grocery Sales									P	P	P	S	S
26. Office Equipment & Supplies								P	P		P	P	P
27. Pet Store							S	P	P		P		
28. Bike Store, Including Rental/Repair							P	P	P		P		P
29. Piece Goods, Sewing Supplies							P	P	P		P		
30. Optical Goods, Health Aids or Appliances								P	P		P		P
31. Fish, Seafood Store									P	P	P		
32. Department, Variety, Discount Store									P		P		
33. Auto Parts, Accessories (new parts)								P	P		P		
34. Second Hand, Used Merchandise Retailers (household items, etc.) a) without outside display/storage b) with outside display/storage								P	P				
35. Storage shed and utility building sales/display									S			P	P
36. Home Improvement Center											P		

¹See Section 24.1-466(g) for special provisions applicable to developments with 80,000 or more square feet of gross floor area.

(Ord. No. 00-15, 8/15/00; Ord. No. 04-2(R), 3/2/04)

USES	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS						
	RC	RR	R20	R13	R7	RMF	NB	LB	GB	WCI	EO	IL	IG
	CATEGORY 11 – BUSINESS / PROFESSIONAL SERVICE												
1. Broadcasting Studio							P	P	P		P	P	P
2. Barber/Beauty Shop							P	P	P		P	P	P
3. Apparel Services (Dry Cleaning/Laundry retail) Laundromat, Tailor, Shoe Repair, Etc.)							P	P	P		P	P	P
4. Funeral Home								S	P		P		
5. a) Photographic Studio							S	P	P		P	P	P
b) Film Processing Lab								S	P		P	P	P
6. Household Items Repair									P		P	P	P
7. Personal Services (Fortune Teller, Tattoo, Pawn Shop, Etc.)									S				
8. a) Banks, Financial Institutions							P	P	P		P		
b) Freestanding Automatic Teller Machines							P	P	P	S	P		
9. Offices						S	P	P	P		P	P	P
10. Hotel & Motel								S	P	S	P		
11. Timeshare Resort						S			S	S	S		
12. Restaurant/Sit Down								P	P		P		
13. Restaurant/Brew-Pub									P		P		
14. Restaurant/Fast Food								S	P		S		
15. Restaurant/Drive In								S	P		S		
16. Restaurant - Carryout/Delivery only							S	P	P		S		
17. Catering Kitchen/Services							S	P	P		S		
18. Nightclub								S	S		S		
19. Commercial Reception Hall or Conference Center							S	S	P		P		
20. Small-Engine Repair (lawn and garden equipment, outboard motors, etc.)									P	P		P	P
21. Tool, Household Equipment, Lawn & Garden Equipment, Rental Establishment									P		P	P	P
22. Establishments Providing Printing, Photocopying, Blueprinting, Mailing, Facsimile Reception & Transmission or similar business services to the general public, and business and professional users								P	P		P	P	P
23. Professional Pharmacy							P	P	P		P		

USES	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS						
	RC	RR	R20	R13	R7	RMF	NB	LB	GB	WCI	EO	IL	IG
	CATEGORY 12 – MOTOR VEHICLE / TRANSPORTATION												
1. Car Wash								S	S		S		
2. Automobile Fuel Dispensing Establishment/ Service Station (May include accessory convenience store and/or car wash)									S		S	S	
3. Auto Repair Garage									S			P	P
4. Auto Body Work & Painting												P	P
5. Auto or Light Truck Sales, Rental, Service (New or used vehicles sales) (Including Motorcycles or R.V.'s)													
a) Without Auto Body Work & Painting									S		S	P	P
b) With Body Work & Painting									S		S	S	P
6. Heavy Truck and Equipment Sales, Rental, Service									S			P	P
7. Farm Equipment Sales, Rental, Service									S			P	P
8. Manufactured Home Sales, Rental, Service									S			S	S
9. Boat Sales, Service, Rental, and Fuel Dispensing									P	P		S	
10. Marine Railway, Boat Building and Repair										P		P	P
11. Truck Stop												S	S
12. Truck Terminal												P	P
13. Heliport									S		S	S	S
14. Helipad									S		S	P	P
15. Airport											S	S	S
16. Bus or Rail Terminal									P		S	P	P
17. Taxi or Limousine Service									P			P	
18. Towing Service / Auto Storage or Impound Yard												S	S
19. Automobile Graveyard, Junkyard													S
20. Bus Service/Repair Facility												P	P

(Ord. No. 04-2(R), 3/2/04)

USES	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS						
	RC	RR	R20	R13	R7	RMF	NB	LB	GB	WCI	EO	IL	IG
	CATEGORY 13 - SHOPPING CENTERS / BUSINESS PARKS ¹												
1. Neighborhood Shopping Center							P	P	P		P		
2. Community or Regional Shopping Center									P		P		
3. Specialty Shopping Center								S	P		P		
4. Office Park								P	P		P	P	P
5. Industrial Park											P	P	P

¹See Section 24.1-481(a)(3) for special provisions applicable to shopping centers with 80,000 or more square feet of gross floor area.
(Ord. No. 00-15, 8/15/00)

Uses permitted in EO but not in LB

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONTACT LOG

November 8 through November 18, 2005

DATE	NAME ADDRESS PHONE #	COMMENT
11/8/05	Norman J. Reid 106 Kentucky Drive Yorktown 23693	Inquired about proposed land use designation changes in Kentucky Heights.
11/8/05	Timothy Matthews 458 Queens Creek Road Williamsburg 23185	Presently has a family subdivision on which he wants to build more homes. Is concerned that the change from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential will limit his options.
11/8/05	Paul Kudlaty 3604 Seaford Road Seaford 23696	Asked about the meaning of the Conservation designation in relation to the Rural Residential zoning classification. Also asked if the designation of Lewis Drive, where he also owns property, is proposed to change.
11/8/05	Diane (David) Hunt 127 York Point Drive Seaford 23696 890-6363	Asked about the meaning of the Conservation designation.
11/8/05	Mr. William Byrum 103 Finch Lane Seaford 23696	Asked about the differences between the Low Density Residential and Conservation designations with regard to property he owns on Bay Tree Beach Road.
11/8/05	David Holland 512 Spivey Lane Seaford 23696	Asked about the difference between the Low Density Residential and Conservation designations. Also inquired about his father's 90 acres in the same area.
11/8/05	Joseph F. Molineaux 109 Creek Circle Seaford 23696	Inquired about the proposed change from Low Density Residential to Conservation in York Point.
11/8/05	Matthew Lee 3012 Lancers Boulevard Richmond VA 23224	Owns a 5.47-acre parcel (458A Queens Creek Road) that he is preparing to sell (as are other property owners in the area) and expressed concern about the reduction in potential lot yield – and hence property value – associated with the proposed change from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential.
11/8/05	Beverly Powell 105 Sycamore Lane Yorktown 23692	Lives in the area of Lackey proposed to change from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential and supports the proposed change, stating that the roads cannot handle the additional traffic that would be generated.
11/8/05	Anastasios J. Georgalas 726 York Point Road Seaford 23696	Asked about the practical effect of the proposed change from Low Density Residential to Conservation in York Point, where he lives on a 1.01-acre parcel. Commented on the importance of keeping density from getting out of hand and opined that the proposed change makes sense.
11/8/05	Dan Copeland 8530 Route 17 Yorktown 23692	Concerned about the proposed change from General Business to Limited Business on Route 17 between Battle Road and Cook Road, which he felt would restrict what could be done with the land and potentially reduce its value.
11/8/05	Kenneth Hayes 107 S. Maple Rd Yorktown 23693	Concerned about the proposed change from Low Density Residential to Limited Industrial in the Kentucky Heights area and its potential for increasing tax assessments as well as permitting industrial uses next to residential uses. Doesn't feel that the County should do whatever the airport wants them to do.
11/8/05	Garry T. Emerson 312 York Point Road Seaford 23696	Inquired about the proposed change from Low Density Residential to Conservation and how it would affect the potential development of vacant property he owns on York Point Road.
11/9/05	Karen Bonniwell 108 Swain Lane Yorktown 23893	Wanted general information on what the letter meant with regard to her property.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONTACT LOG (continued)

DATE	NAME ADDRESS PHONE #	COMMENT
11/9/05	Margo Bavuso (Salvatore) 8640 Route 17 Yorktown 23692	Operates a day care center and owns 3 adjacent acres on which she wants to establish a different type of business in the future, such as dog day care. Concerned that ultimate rezoning will limit her potential uses.
11/9/05	Jake G. Zalumas 8619 Route 17 Yorktown 23692 898-5948	Agrees that his two parcels on Route 17 should be changed from Medium Density Residential, but he felt that, since the parcels are zoned General Business and have been assessed as such for many years, they should be designated General Business rather than Limited Business as proposed. (He will not be able to attend the public hearing.)
11/9/05	Robert E Schlegel 7320 Glenroe Ave #11D Norfolk 23505	Asked about possible uses if his property in the Bay Tree Beach area is changed from Low Density Residential to Conservation. He opposes the proposed change and indicated that he may want to establish an aquaculture business such as a hatchery and has a signed letter authorizing that use. (NOTE: The property in question is already zoned Resource Conservation, and aquaculture is a permitted use.)
11/9/05	Nannie Hudson 3017 Big Bethel Road Yorktown 23693	Has a concern that her property will be devalued as a result of the proposed change from General Business to Limited Business. Wants to make sure that any businesses that go on her lot in the future will be compatible with the abutting residential use.
11/9/05	Zetie Damron 416 Spivey Lane Seaford 23696	Wanted to know the definition of Conservation and expressed satisfaction with the proposed designation since it would reduce future growth in the neighborhood.
11/9/05	Linda Reviea 206 Bay Tree Beach Road Seaford 23696	Concerned about the potential loss in value of property and future expansion of home on the lot. Liked that new density would be less intense.
11/9/05	Dennis Leggett 913 Bay Tree Beach Road Seaford 23696	Asked what the Conservation designation means and if more construction would be restricted. Owns no property except the existing residence and has no objection to the proposed change.
11/9/05	Rhonda Buckanin 300 Presson Road Lot 9 Seaford 23696	Owns property at 4013 Seaford Road, 1009 Bay Tree Beach Road, and 1011 Bay Tree Beach Road. Requested information about rezoning the Seaford Road property from RC to RR and asked about building on an existing vacant lot on Bay Tree Beach Road.
11/9/05	Sandra Kimrey 3692 Seaford Road Seaford 23696	Asked if the proposed change from Low Density Residential to Conservation on Seaford Road would affect her ability to add a deck onto her home or rebuild the home in the event it were destroyed by natural causes.
11/9/05	James O'Hara P. O. Box 408 Yorktown 23690	Asked about the difference between the Limited Business and General Business designations and expressed a preference for General Business for his property on Route 17 (rather than Limited Business as proposed). He indicated that he would like for a quality hotel to be developed on the property, which would be permitted by right with GB zoning but would require a Special Use Permit under LB zoning.
11/10/05	Mrs. Camp P. O. Box 25 (6320 Old Mooretown Rd) Williamsburg 23185	Did not speak English very well and wanted further explanation about what the letter meant.
11/10/05	Beverly Kirby 8608 Route 17 Yorktown 23692	Asked about the limitations that would result from the proposed change from General Business to Limited Business for the convenience store/gas station at the corner of Route 17 and Harrod Lane. Specifically wanted to know what limits they would encounter if they changed their hours of operation or wanted to have some type of restaurant on the property.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONTACT LOG (continued)

DATE	NAME ADDRESS PHONE #	COMMENT
11/10/05	Henry Oakley 3203 Old Cluster Springs Road South Boston VA 24592	Asked about the effect of the proposed redesignation of his property on Wildey Road from Low Density Residential to Conservation.
11/10/05	Brooklyn Presson (Mr.) 309 Presson Road Seaford 23696	Asked about the effect of the proposed redesignation of his two acres on Presson & Wildey Roads from Low Density Residential to Conservation. Thinks it would be a good idea.
11/10/05	Janice Orr 1017 Bay Tree Beach Rd Seaford 23696	Liked the idea of lowering the intensity of development in the area. Wanted to protect the wetlands/marshes and reduce the impact on emergency evacuation from her area.
11/10/05	Dr. Roger Shultz 6413 Conversancy Road Williamsburg 23185	Wants his property at 6268 Old Mooretown Road to remain Economic Opportunity so that he can have future use as a medical office connecting to the ring road around the hospital. Approves of the proposed change from Economic Opportunity to Low Density Residential for his parcel at 6270 Old Mooretown Road; however, if he cannot gain access to the ring road then he would remove the existing single-family structure and apply to rezone the parcel to EO so that access to the rear parcel (6268) could come from Old Mooretown Road.
11/10/05	Annette Hopson 3210 Big Bethel Road Yorktown 23693	Expressed no concerns over the proposed redesignation of her property on Big Bethel Road from General Business to Limited Business. She is not selling her land any time soon. Would like to have sewer project expedited to facilitate removal of aged septic systems in neighborhood.
11/10/05	Warren Matthews 226 Hansford Lane Seaford 23696	Does not object to the proposed change from Low Density Residential to Conservation.
11/10/05	Marshall Toney Represents owner, Mr Lee Queens Creek Road	Inquired about recommendation to redesignate from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential.
11/10/05	Ms. Robinson-Davis Daughter of Fred Robinson 1775 Lauder Avenue Jacksonville FL 32208	Inquired about the proposal to redesignate her father's land at 1707 Baptist Road from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential and if it would affect the land value.
11/10/05	Ms. Woodman 418 Wildey Road Seaford 23696	Requested information on what it meant to change from Low Density to Conservation. Additionally, she wanted to know impacts on their house.
11/10/05	Elfreda Wynder 116 Tillerson Road Newport News 23602	Is extremely upset that her property on Big Bethel Road is proposed to change from General Business to Limited Business. Feels that it is racially motivated and takes away her ability to sell the land in the future for its full economic benefit.
11/10/05	Bill Muntean 4018 GW Highway Yorktown 23692	Inquired about difference between Low Density Residential and Conservation with respect to a relative's property in York Point.
11/10/05	William Baggett 1315 Waterview Rd Yorktown 23692	Inquired about the difference between Limited Business and Low Density Residential.
11/14/05	Janice Orr 1017 Bay Tree Beach Rd Seaford 23696 898-4088	Questioned the accuracy of the Environment element discussion relative to shoreline erosion in the Bay Tree Beach area and whether or not the beach is eroding as quickly as stated. (NOTE: Staff subsequently looked into this question and verified the accuracy of the plan as written. While some properties in the area have gained as others have eroded, the overall net loss is as stated in the plan. This information was relayed to the property owner and alleviated her concerns.)

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONTACT LOG (continued)

DATE	NAME ADDRESS PHONE #	COMMENT
11/14/05	Kevin Barry 3307 Big Bethel Road Yorktown 23693	Asked about the difference between the General Business and Limited Business designations. Liked that it would limit the impact of businesses on the nearby residential areas.
11/14/05	Darlene Wilcox 117 Plantation Drive Williamsburg 23185	Inquired about how to respond to the Board about the proposed change in land use designation.
11/14/05	Ann Dail 524 Old Taylor Road Williamsburg 23188 af4forhim@widomaker.com	Requested directions for downloading the draft plan from the web site so she could read it.
11/15/05	Judy Lucas 503 Wildey Road Seaford 23696	Inquired about the possibility of rebuilding house and accessory structures after a disaster if the property were designated Conservation. Was happy with the proposal to reduce density in the area and help to maintain the rural character.
11/15/05	Susan Rowe 3915 Seaford Road Seaford 23696	Inquired about the meaning of the proposed redesignation from Low Density Residential to Conservation and approved of the fact that there would be no resulting increase in density.
11/15/05	Edith Lee 1239 Oak Drive Williamsburg 23185 (James City County)	Owens undeveloped property in the Queens Creek Road area that is proposed for redesignation from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential and inquired about the difference. She plans to attend the November 15 meeting.
11/16/05	Ilonka Dazevido 501 Wildey Road Seaford 23696	Inquired about the potential effect of the proposed redesignation from Low Density Residential to Conservation for the home she co-owns. Was satisfied that it would not be affected.
11/16/05	Steve Edwards 208 Presson Road Seaford 23696	Inquired about the potential effect of the proposed redesignation from Low Density Residential to Conservation on his home. Was satisfied that it would not be affected.
11/17/05	R. J. Schaefer 116 Oriana Road Yorktown 23693 874-4908	Resides and owns property at 116 Oriana Road and opposes the proposed change from Low Density Residential to Limited Industrial for Kentucky Farms.
11/18/05	Darlene Wilcox 117 Plantation Drive Williamsburg 23185	Asked about the difference between the Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential designations and expressed her support for the proposed redesignation to Low Density Residential, citing congestion problems on Waller Mill Road and the need to prevent overcrowding of the land.
11/18/05	Michael and Bernadetta Messana 42 Locust Lane East Rutherford NJ 07073	Own three parcels (309, 311, and 313) on Waller Mill Road and are opposed to the proposed change from Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential. Feel that Medium Density is more compatible with surrounding development and nearby zoning.
11/18/05	Kathleen Burke 4401 Clermont Drive NE Apt 121 Washington DC 20011	Opposes the proposed change from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential for her 13.5-acre parcel in the Baptist Road area. She is concerned about the resulting loss in property value and the fact that her property is landlocked.
11/18/05	Mrs. Robert Lowe 602 Allens Mill Road Yorktown 23692	Inquired about the difference between High Density Residential and Low Density Residential with regard to a 1.5-acre parcel she owns on Baptist Road. Also asked about the possibility of rezoning her property on Allens Mill Road from RR to R13.

O:\Comp Plan 2025\Publicity\Correspondence\Comp Plan contact log.doc